

Christian Anarchism: A Revolutionary Reading of the Bible

Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos

*Department of Politics and International Relations
Rutherford College, University of Kent
Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NX
United Kingdom
ajmec@kent.ac.uk*

*Paper presented at the **Comparative Political Theology (II)** panel of the
Religion, Globalisation and Security section of the **World International
Studies Conference** in Ljubljana, 23-26 July 2008*

Work in progress – please contact the author before citing[†]

[†] The author wishes to acknowledge that an earlier draft of this paper was presented as part of a stream of panels convened by the Anarchist Studies Network (then the Specialist Group on the Study of Anarchism) at the 56th Political Studies Association Annual Conference, hosted by the University of Reading on 3-6 April 2006; and that this revised version has been included in a book proposal for an anthology entitled “New Perspectives on Anarchism,” edited by Nathan Jun, Sol Needy, and Shane Wahl, to “Out Sources: Philosophy-Culture-Politics,” a new series published by Lexington Press (USA).

Christianity in its true sense puts an end to the State. It was so understood from its very beginning, and for that Christ was crucified.

– Leo Tolstoy

Where there is no love, put love and you will find love.

– St. John of the Cross

Christianity and anarchism are rarely thought to belong together. Surely, the argument goes, Christianity is about as hierarchic a structure as you can get, and anarchism is not only the negation of any hierarchy but it is also often stubbornly secular and anti-clerical. Yet as Ciaron O'Reilly warns, Christian anarchism "is not an attempt to synthesise two systems of thought" that are hopelessly incompatible; rather, it is "a realisation that the premise of anarchism is inherent in christianity and the message of the Gospels."¹ For Christian anarchists, an honest and consistent application of Christianity would result in a political arrangement that would amount to anarchism, and it is actually the notion of a "Christian state" that, just like "hot ice," is a contradiction in terms, an oxymoron.² Thus Christian anarchism is not about forcing together two very different systems of thought – it is about pursuing the political implications of Christianity to the fullest extent.

This paper will explore this unusual and revolutionary political vision by conveying some of the observations made by some of its main proponents. The most famous of these is undoubtedly Leo Tolstoy – he is often the *only* example of Christian anarchism cited in the academic literature on anarchism.³ Among the aficionados, however, Jacques Ellul is also very famous, and people usually also know about Vernard Eller and Dave Andrews. Also well known are some of the figures associated with the Catholic Worker movement (especially popular in the United States), in particular Dorothy Day, Peter Maurin, and Ammon Hennacy. The Christian anarchist literature is also enriched by contributions from thinkers at its margins, who are perhaps not the most vociferous fanatics of pure Christian anarchism, or perhaps not Christian anarchists consistently (perhaps writing anarchist texts for only a brief period of their life), or perhaps better categorised as pacifists or Christian subversives than anarchists but whose writings complement Christian anarchist ones. These include Peter Chelčický, Nicholas Berdyaev, William Lloyd Garrison, Hugh Pentecost, Adin Ballou, Ched Myers, Michael Elliott, and Jonathan Bartley among others.⁴ Finally, Christian anarchist also has its anarcho-capitalists, like James Redford and James Kevin Craig.⁵ This paper will not discuss them all, but will draw from most of them in an

¹ Ciaron O'Reilly, "The Anarchist Implications of Christian Discipleship," *Social Alternatives* 2/3 (1982): 9 (sic).

² Leo Tolstoy, "Church and State," in *On Life and Essays on Religion*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 338.

³ Tolstoy wrote too many Christian anarchist texts to give an exhaustive list of these here, but the most frequently cited one is Leo Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," in *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, trans. Aylmer Maude (New Delhi: Rupa, 2001). For good introductions to Tolstoy's Christian anarchist writings, see the sources listed in the bibliography.

⁴ John H. Yoder is also cited in this paper because, despite being a pacifist Mennonite who was keen to dissociate himself from the anarchist conclusions that his argument has been said to lead to, his writings do further reinforce certain flanks of the Christian anarchist critique.

attempt to extract some of the main arguments made in the Christian anarchist literature.

The first section discusses the central role that Christian anarchists assign to love as the basis of Christian anarchism. The second looks more closely at the Christian anarchist reading of some key Biblical passages, including the “render unto Caesar” incident and Romans 13. This is followed by a brief explanation of why their specific understanding of Christianity is hardly being heard of today. The fourth section outlines some of Tolstoy’s direct criticisms of the state. The fifth lists a few examples of Christian anarchism, past and present. The paper then closes with some concluding remarks on the overlap of religion and politics presented by Christian anarchism.

1. Love: the heart of the revolution

Where modern (certainly Hobbesian) political theory deals with injustice and insecurity by force, by giving the monopoly over the legitimate use of force to the state, Christian anarchism argues that the best response to violence and injustice is actually Christian love. That is, Christian anarchists believe that a just social order can only be secured through the persistent enactment of brotherly love, not through any system of rewards and punishments policed by a scolding father. The ordering principle of society would thus be love, not the threat of violence.

According to Tolstoy, the essence of this Christian alternative is best expressed in Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount, and in particular in the following verses:

You have heard that it was said, “Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth.”

But I tell you, Do not resist an evil person. If someone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.

And if someone wants to sue you and take your tunic, let him have your cloak as well.

If someone forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles.

Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away from the one who wants to borrow from you.⁶

Tolstoy thus understands Jesus as spelling out a completely new and wiser method for human beings to deal with evil, with fear, violence or insecurity: when treated unjustly, do not use force or retaliate, but respond with love, forgiveness and generosity. Dave Andrews agrees: “Christ is the archetype of compassion – the original model of radical, non-violent, sacrificial love – which humanity desperately needs, now more than ever, if it is to find a way to save itself from the cycles of violence that will otherwise destroy it.”⁷

For all Christian anarchists, the radical political innovation of Jesus’ message was therefore to put forward a completely different way of responding to whatever may be seen as evil. That is, even in the face of unjust demands, behave like a generous and loving servant; do not rebel, do not get aggressive, and certainly do not even contemplate using power to enforce your view of justice. In the eyes of Christian

⁵ Craig is the person behind the otherwise anonymous Vine and Fig Tree websites; see for instance [Anonymous], *Ninety-Five Theses in Defense of Patriarchy* (Vine and Fig Tree), available from <http://members.aol.com/VF95Theses/thesis.htm> (accessed 20 April 2007). There are also many Christian anarcho-capitalist contributors to three key websites: <http://www.lewrockwell.com>, <http://www.strike-the-root.com> and <http://www.libertariannation.org>.

⁶ Matthew 5:38-42. (Note that all Bible quotes in this paper are from the New international Version.)

⁷ Dave Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy: Discovering a Radical Spirituality of Compassion* (Oxford: Lion, 1999), 100.

anarchists, the political implications are self-evident: the only response to disorder and insecurity in human relations is not to delegate power to a state, but to act as Jesus taught and acted – even if the ultimate price is one’s own death, as explained in more detail further below in the discussion of Jesus’ crucifixion.

Of course, this means that the Christian anarchist has to abandon the apparent effectiveness of social engineering. Inasmuch as s/he wishes to change the world, in Dorothy Day’s words, s/he can only do this “one heart at a time.”⁸ Christian anarchists thus believe in persuasion by example, not force. The hope is that love and forgiveness eventually win over the evildoer through the heart. Impressed by such radical love and forgiveness, one day the evildoer may well repent. But in the meantime, cheeks keep being smitten and coats keep being taken away. The Christian anarchist, however, does not seek punishment and redress but patiently and generously forgives the wrongdoer.

Hence to use Vernard Eller’s words, the Christian anarchist chooses the path of “voluntary self-subordination” as the “model of social justice.”⁹ Andrews therefore speaks of treating Christ as a *model* rather than an *idol*:

The example of Christ [...] is so powerful that many of us find it overpowering and, therefore, unfortunately, disempowering, rather than empowering as it ought to be.

So we tend to treat Christ as our *idol*, someone we’d like to be like, but know we never will be like; rather than our *model*, someone we’d like to be like, and do our best to be sure we are like. But Christ never wanted to be an *idol*. He never asked anyone to worship him. Christ only wanted to *model* how to live life to the full. And all he asked of people who wanted to live this way was to follow him.¹⁰

Christian anarchists thus bemoan the fact that Christianity has evolved into the worship of an idol rather than the personal and collective effort to imitate Jesus and thereby represent him (make him present) in the world.

Yet if, instead of delegating government of society to a system that legitimises some violence and punishment, Christians were to choose to govern their lives by love and compassion, then there would be no need for a state. The only thing that would “govern” or steer this stateless society would be love. Humanity would resemble the original meaning of *ekklesia* as a “gathering” of individuals into community and communion.¹¹ And gradually, more and more people would indeed gather because “the beauty of love and justice embodied in [these] communities will encourage all men and all women of goodwill to continue to do good works as well.”¹² Christian anarchists therefore also reject any separation of ends and means: violence breeds violence, and only love can breed love and gather humanity into a peaceful community.¹³

Of course, this goal does appear distant and utopian, and it is easy to accuse Christian anarchists of lack of realism. Love, forgiveness and non-resistance to evil are

⁸ This expression, which she attributes to “Peace News,” is quoted by Dorothy Day in the *London Catholic Worker* 13 (April 2005), 6.

⁹ Vernard Eller, *Christian Anarchy: Jesus’ Primacy over the Powers* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1987), chap. 10 for an elaboration of this argument (pages 239-240 for the quoted words).

¹⁰ Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*, 114 (Andrews’ emphasis).

¹¹ Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, 49.

¹² Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*, 126.

¹³ This is explored further in the context of a discussion of international terrorism in Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, “Turning the Other Cheek to Terrorism: Reflections on the Contemporary Significance of Leo Tolstoy’s Exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount,” *Politics and Religion* 1/1 (2008).

difficult enough to enact on a personal level, let alone as a whole community. But in reply to this contention, Tolstoy has this to say:

It may be affirmed that the constant fulfilment of this rule [of love and non-resistance] is difficult, and that not every man will find his happiness in obeying it. It may be said that it is foolish; that, as unbelievers pretend, Jesus was a visionary, an idealist, whose impracticable rules were only followed because of the stupidity of his disciples. But it is impossible not to admit that Jesus did say very clearly and definitely that which he intended to say: namely, that men should not resist evil; and that therefore he who accepts his teaching cannot resist.¹⁴

In other words, although the practicality of Christian anarchists' vision can be argued upon, the grounding of it in scripture is harder to dispute. They certainly believe that their interpretation is validated by countless passages of the New Testament, and that any other interpretation that compromises with the state exposes both hypocrisy and a lack of faith in the very essence of Jesus' teaching. According to Christian anarchists, the political implications of Christianity might be utopian, but they are made clear throughout the Bible: Jesus articulated the foundations of a community based on love, a community in which love and forgiveness can be the only response to injustice and insecurity, a community therefore that cannot but reject the state as we know it.

2. Other passages in the Bible

Aside from numerous verses on love and forgiveness, Christian anarchists point to several passages in both the Old and New Testament to further validate their interpretation of Christianity. Only the most significant of these can be reviewed here – but many more can be found in the Christian anarchist literature.¹⁵

One example concerns one of Jesus' temptations in the wilderness, which reads as follows:

Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor.

“All this I will give you,” he said, “if you will bow down and worship me.”

Jesus said to him, “Away from me, Satan! For it is written: ‘Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only.’”¹⁶

Jacques Ellul argues that according to this text, “all powers, all the power and glory of the kingdoms, all that has to do with politics and political authority, belongs to the devil.”¹⁷ It is moreover important to note that Jesus does not deny that political power does indeed belong to the devil. Rather, “he refuses the offer of power because the

¹⁴ Leo Tolstoy, *What I Believe <My Religion>*, trans. Fyvie Mayo? (London: C. W. Daniel, [1902?]), 18-19.

¹⁵ Among the passages on which Christian anarchists collectively offer extensive comments (and which are not already mentioned in this paper), one finds Jesus' many proclamations about forgiveness and about service to others, his answer to the crowd who wanted to stone the adulteress, his arrest and trial, and other sayings from the Sermon on the Mount, such as the commandments to love enemies, not to judge, not to swear and not to be angry, the Golden Rule, and the claim that he came not to “destroy” but “fulfil” the old law.

¹⁶ Matthew 4:8-10.

¹⁷ Jacques Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, trans. George W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991), 58. See also Archie Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State* (Hagerstown: James Lowry/Deutsche Buchhandlung, 2000), 36-38; James Redford, *Jesus Is an Anarchist: A Free-Market, Libertarian Anarchist, That Is - Otherwise What Is Called an Anarcho-Capitalist*, available from <http://praxeology.net/anarchist-jesus.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2006), 22-24.

devil demands that he should fall down before him and worship him.”¹⁸ Jesus refuses political power because it would entail worship of the devil. So Jesus declines the possibility of changing the world through political channels.¹⁹ He rejects the state because he can only serve one Lord, and it is not possible to serve both God and the state.

Ellul notices that a similar point is made in the Old Testament.²⁰ Until Samuel, Israel had no king. Decisions were taken mostly by popular assembly: “people did what was right in their own eyes.”²¹ But in 1 Samuel 8, people told Samuel that they wanted a king so that they could be like other nations and have more efficient military leadership. As Ellul explains, “Samuel protested and went to God in prayer. The God of Israel replied: Do not be upset. The people have not rejected you, Samuel, but me, God. [...] Accept their demand but warn them of what will happen.”²² Samuel then warned them of all the abuses of power that would ensue, but they wanted their king. Thus, they chose an earthly ruler, a state, instead of God. That is, they opted for idolatry, for the service and worship of the state rather than God.²³ (Note that even though he disapproved, God allowed them to freely reject him.²⁴)

Another important passage in terms of how to respond to fear and insecurity can be found in Matthew 26:51-52. Jesus has just been betrayed by Judas, and is about to be taken away. One of his disciples then draws out his sword and strikes one of the guards. But Jesus famously tells him to put away his sword, because “all who draw the sword will die by the sword.”²⁵ So once again, even in the face of perceived injustice or insecurity, do not resort to any violence, because “it can only give rise to further violence.”²⁶ And as Ellul notes, the warning applies quite broadly. On the one hand, “since the state uses the sword, it will be destroyed by the sword, as centuries of history have shown us.”²⁷ But on the other, this can also be seen as a caution to Christians: “do not fight the state with the sword, for if you do, you will be killed by

¹⁸ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 58.

¹⁹ Linda H. Damico, *The Anarchist Dimension of Liberation Theology* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), 78-79, 89-90; Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, 10; Michael C. Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture* (London: SCM, 1990), 157-158.

²⁰ Note that on the whole, Christian anarchists comment much less on the Old Testament than on the New. While some treat it with patience and interest, others (Tolstoy in particular) disregard it as almost completely irrelevant to the radical teaching of Jesus.

²¹ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 47.

²² Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 48.

²³ Stephen W. Carson, *Biblical Anarchism*, available from <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/carson2.html> (accessed 8 November 2007); Tom Lock, ed., *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life and a Translation from Czech of Part One of His Net of Faith*, by Enrico C. S. Molnár (Oberlin: www.nonresistance.org, 2006), available from <http://www.nonresistance.org/literature.html> (accessed 28 March 2007), 93; Michael Tennant, *Christianarchy? (Strike the Root)*, available from <http://www.strike-the-root.com/51/tennant/tennant5.html> (accessed 21 November 2007); Michael Tennant, *Government as Idolatry (Strike the Root)*, available from <http://www.strike-the-root.com/3/tennant/tennant1.html> (accessed 21 November 2007).

²⁴ Nekeisha Alexis-Baker, "Embracing God, Rejecting Masters," *Christianarchy* 1/1 (2005): 2; Dave Andrews, *Subversive Spirituality, Ecclesial and Civil Disobedience: A Survey of Biblical Politics as Incarnated in Jesus and Interpreted by Paul*, available from <http://anz.jesusradicals.com/subspirit.pdf> (accessed 17 July 2006), 4.

²⁵ Matthew 26:52. Note that Christian anarchists often just cite this saying, without commenting much on it, assuming that it fairly self-evidently confirms their understanding of Jesus' teaching.

²⁶ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 65.

²⁷ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 65.

the sword.”²⁸ Violence should never be used, neither to hold political authority nor to overthrow it. And if violence *is* used, then no validation for it can be claimed from Christianity, because Jesus explicitly denounces it.

So, Christian anarchists understand Christianity to be strictly incompatible with the state and political power; for them, Christianity provides the blueprint for a non-violent, anarchist revolution. However, there are two important phrases from the New Testament that are frequently raised against Christian anarchists as if these self-evidently contradict their political interpretation: “render to Caesar,” and Paul’s instructions in Romans 13. These must now be analysed in turn to show why Christian anarchists consider them not as contradicting but as actually confirming their own interpretation.

It is important to recall the details of the “render to Caesar” episode before commenting on it.²⁹ The story reads as follows:

Later they sent some of the Pharisees and Herodians to Jesus to catch him in his words.

They came to him and said, “Teacher, we know you are a man of integrity. You aren’t swayed by men, because you pay no attention to who they are; but you teach the way of God in accordance with the truth. Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?

Should we pay or shouldn’t we?” But Jesus knew their hypocrisy. “Why are you trying to trap me?” he asked. “Bring me a denarius and let me look at it.”

They brought the coin, and he asked them, “Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?” “Caesar’s,” they replied.

Then Jesus said to them, “Give to Caesar what is Caesar’s and to God what is God’s.”

And they were amazed at him.³⁰

Ellul notes that in the first place, if they put this question to Jesus, it must have been because it was already debated, and Jesus must have had “the reputation of being hostile to Caesar.”³¹ But aside from this, it must be borne in mind that “in the Roman world an individual mark on an object denoted ownership.”³² Hence the coin did actually belong to Caesar.³³ No surprise, then, that Jesus says “Give it back to him when he demands it.”³⁴ Nevertheless, as Ellul notices, “Jesus does not say that taxes are lawful.”³⁵

So the key question is “what really belongs to Caesar?” Ellul replies: “Whatever bears his mark! Here is the basis and limit of his power. But where is his mark? On coins, on public monuments, and on certain altars. That is all. [...] On the other hand, whatever does not bear Caesar’s mark does not belong to him. It belongs to God.”³⁶ For instance, Caesar has no right over life and death. That belongs to God. Hence while the state can expect Christians to abide by its wishes regarding its

²⁸ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 65.

²⁹ The exposition of the Christian anarchist argument here follows Ellul. But one can also find interesting and similar remarks in Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, chap. 4 and 8; Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 51-53; Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark’s Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988), 310-314; Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 49-52; Redford, *Jesus Is an Anarchist*, 10-11; John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster*, Second ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1994), chap. 2.

³⁰ Mark 12:13-17.

³¹ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 59.

³² Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 59.

³³ The same logic still applies today, as a close look at the small print of most bank notes exposes.

³⁴ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 60.

³⁵ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 60.

³⁶ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 60.

belongings, it has no right to kill dissidents or plunge a country into war.³⁷ Therefore the “render to Caesar” episode seems to reinforce, not weaken, the case made by Christian anarchists. Some things do belong to Caesar, but many more essential things belong to God, and the state is overstepping its mark when it encroaches upon God’s domain.

But then what about Romans 13? There, Paul does clearly assert: “Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God.”³⁸ Does this verse and those following it not finally defeat the Christian anarchist fallacy? After all, this passage has often been used to justify the divine institution of civil government – up to and including the Nazis.³⁹

Here again, however, Christian anarchists offer a compelling response.⁴⁰ For a start, one must realise that Romans 12 and 13 “in their entirety form a literary unit.”⁴¹ In both chapters, Paul is writing about love and sacrifice, about overcoming evil with good, about willingly offering oneself up for persecution. In doing so, he is mainly repeating the message that Jesus articulated not only in the Sermon on the Mount and other parables, but also in the very way he lived and died – indeed, Jesus’ ultimate act of love and sacrifice was to subject himself to Roman crucifixion.⁴² But the point is that as John Yoder asserts, “any interpretation of 13:1-7 which is not also an expression of suffering and serving love must be a misunderstanding of the text in its context.”⁴³ And in Ellul’s words, once one interprets Romans 12 and 13 as a coherent whole, one notes that “there is a progression of love from friends to strangers and then to enemies, and this is where the passage then comes. In other words, we must love enemies and therefore we must even respect the authorities.”⁴⁴ Hence Paul’s message in Romans 13 is to call for Christians to subject themselves to political powers *out of love*, forgiveness and sacrifice.

It is also worth repeating Eller’s point that to “be subject to” does not mean to worship, to “recognise the legitimacy of” or to “own allegiance to.”⁴⁵ Ellul thus comments that “we have no right to claim God in validation of this order as if he were at our service. [...] This takes away all the pathos, justification, illusion, enthusiasm, etc” that can be associated with any specific political authority.⁴⁶ So no specific government has any particularly special relationship with God, even though God will use it in his mysterious ordering of the cosmos.⁴⁷ Therefore, according to Ellul, “the

³⁷ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 61.

³⁸ Romans 13:1.

³⁹ Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, 193.

⁴⁰ The argument summarised here is a combination of the following: Nekeisha Alexis-Manners, *Deconstructing Romans 13: Verse 1-2*, available from <http://www.jesusradicals.com/essays/theology/Romans13.htm> (accessed 28 October 2005); Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, chap. 8; Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, chap. 2 and appendix; Lock, ed., *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life*, sect. 8 and 9; Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, chap. 4; Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, chap. 9 and 10.

⁴¹ Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, 196.

⁴² Alexis-Manners, *Deconstructing Romans 13*; Dave Andrews, *The Crux of the Struggle*, available from <http://www.daveandrews.com.au/publications.html> (accessed 3 December 2006).

⁴³ Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, 196.

⁴⁴ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 81.

⁴⁵ Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, 199.

⁴⁶ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 88.

⁴⁷ Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, 202.

only one whom we must fear is God,” and “the only one to whom honour is due is God” – not political authorities.⁴⁸

But anyhow, “the immediate concrete meaning of this text for the Christian Jews in Rome,” Yoder indicates, “is to call them away from any notion of revolution or insubordination. The call is to a non-resistant attitude towards a tyrannical government.”⁴⁹ Paul is calling for Roman Christians to act as Jesus did. Besides, if you choose resistance, Eller remarks, “you could find yourself resisting the particular use God has in mind for that empire” – whatever that might prove to be.⁵⁰ Thus Paul, just as Jesus did before him, is advising against a violent political uprising and instead encouraging Christians to cultivate love, sacrifice and forgiveness. Paul is endorsing neither the Roman establishment nor any uprising to overthrow it, but reminding followers of Jesus that what matters is to focus on God and Jesus’ radical and no less revolutionary commandments.⁵¹ Thus, Romans 13, when understood in its context, ends up supporting rather than discrediting Christian anarchists.

As already hinted, this touches on the core of the seemingly paradoxical understanding of Jesus’ teaching by Christian anarchists. That is, Jesus’ political subversion is carried out through submission rather than revolt. Jesus’ crucifixion is the Biblical episode which best illustrates this.⁵² For Christian anarchists, the cross is the symbol both of state violence and persecution, *and* of Jesus’ alternative to overcome it. To paraphrase from Paul, by submitting to his crucifixion – even uttering as his last words a call for God to “forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing”⁵³ – Jesus “makes a public example” of the state, “unmasks” it as violent and demonic and “dethrones” it from its power and perceived legitimacy.⁵⁴ By submitting to his crucifixion, Jesus demonstrates that love and forgiveness, even – indeed, *especially* – in the face of violence and vindictiveness, must go to the very end. Hence Jesus’ submission is subversive because it unmasks the true nature of the state and at the same time embodies his alternative to overcome it. At the cross, Jesus and his teaching, although seemingly crushed, are paradoxically exalted. However surprising this may at first seem, the cross thus symbolises Christianity’s anarchist subversion. And of course, Jesus repeatedly demands of his followers that they take up their cross and follow him, in other words that they reject violence, accept persecution and nonetheless keep on striving to love and forgive both their neighbours and their enemies – just like he did.⁵⁵

This does not mean, however, that Jesus asks from his followers that they remain completely silent when faced with injustice.⁵⁶ Jesus himself set the tone when he

⁴⁸ Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 81.

⁴⁹ Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, 202.

⁵⁰ Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, 203.

⁵¹ Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, 41; Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, chap. 9 and 10.

⁵² The argument summarised in this paragraph is mostly based on the following: Andrews, *The Crux of the Struggle*; Jonathan Bartley, *Faith and Politics after Christendom: The Church as a Movement for Anarchy* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), chap. 11; Hendrik Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers*, trans. John Howard Yoder (Scottsdale: Herald, 1977); Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, 83-85; Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*; Walter Wink, *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992); Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, chap. 2 and 8.

⁵³ Luke 23:34.

⁵⁴ See Colossians 2:15 and its interpretation by the authors cited above.

⁵⁵ For instance: Matthew 10:38, 16:24; Mark 8:34, 10:21; Luke 9:23, 14:27.

⁵⁶ Note also that there seems to be a tension in Jesus’ teaching between pure non-resistance and non-violent resistance, but there is not enough space to discuss it here. A short discussion of it is available in Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, “Leo Tolstoy on the State: A Detailed Picture of Tolstoy’s Denunciation of State Violence and Deception,” *Anarchist Studies* 16/1 (2008).

stormed and cleansed the Jerusalem temple – an event that fixed the resolve of the authorities to have him arrested and executed.⁵⁷ In commenting on this event, Christian anarchists emphasise that this temple was Israel's most potent religious, political and economic symbol. Jesus' "direct action" against it is therefore a clear statement of opposition against such concentration of power and authority. For Christian anarchists, too much attention has been distracted from these broader political implications by endlessly debating whether Jesus' action was violent. Besides, they argue that very little violence was used anyway: only one Gospel mentions a whip, and it does so only in relation to the cattle in the temple. Thus if any physical violence was used, it was clearly only to drive out the cattle – not to strike any human being. And if Jesus' verbal condemnation is nonetheless a form of violence, then that is the limit of the violence that Jesus allows. Indeed, Jesus does repeatedly denounce, in strong terms, the religious and political authorities of his day. Christian anarchists only regret that today's self-proclaimed followers of Jesus hardly ever repeat such courageous denunciations of political, religious and economic power.

3. Christian history

If Christian anarchists are correct, however, how come their version of Christianity is mostly unheard of today? The short answer is that the church colluded with the state and thereby compromised the essence of Jesus' teaching. For Christian anarchists, the symbolic moment which epitomised the degeneration of Christianity was Emperor Constantine's "conversion," when "Christ, who had turned the Roman empire upside down, was turned into a lap-dog for the Roman emperor."⁵⁸ The early church had strived to enact Jesus' teaching. But with Constantine's reforms, what had begun as a voluntary, nonviolent movement, a conscious choice of love, forgiveness and sacrifice eventually became a compulsory and hence meaningless tag synonymous with the status quo.⁵⁹ And predictably, scriptural exegesis was thereafter reassessed in order to justify unquestioning obedience to the state.

⁵⁷ Matthew 21:12-16; Mark 11:15-18; Luke 19:45-48; John 2:13-17. The Christian anarchist commentary summarised here is based on the following: Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*, 149; Dave Andrews, *Not Religion, but Love: Practicing a Radical Spirituality of Compassion* (Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2001), 65-66; Andy Baker, *Nonviolent Action in the Temple*, available from <http://www.jesusradicals.com/essays/theology/temple.html> (accessed 16 May 2006); Adin Ballou, *Non-Resistance in Relation to Human Governments* (www.nonresistance.org), available from <http://www.nonresistance.org/literature.html> (accessed 28 March 2007), 29-31; Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 80, 166-167, 180-181; Robert Ellsberg, ed., *Dorothy Day: Selected Writings: By Little and by Little* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2005), 344; Peter Maurin, *Easy Essays* (Washington: Rose Hill, 2003), 3; Jim Missey and Joan Thomas, eds., *The Book of Ammon*, by Ammon Hennacy, Second ed. (Baltimore: Fortkamp, 1994), xix, 381, 433; Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 297-306; Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 68-69; Leo Tolstoy, "The Gospel in Brief," in *A Confession and the Gospel in Brief*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 146-238; Leo Tolstoy, "The Teaching of Jesus," in *On Life and Essays on Religion*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 379; Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*, 40-43.

⁵⁸ Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*, 70.

⁵⁹ See for instance Bartley, *Faith and Politics after Christendom*, chap. 2 and 3; O'Reilly, "The Anarchist Implications of Christian Discipleship," 10; Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, chap. 2.

Tolstoy uses particularly strong language to condemn this corruption of Christianity.⁶⁰ Although the following are not his words but Henry George's, he quotes them at length because they eloquently echo his view:

The Christian revelation was the doctrine stating the equality of men, that God is the Father and that all men are brothers. It struck to the core of the monstrous tyranny which inspired the civilized world; it smashed the slaves' chains and annihilated the enormous injustice whereby a small group of people could live in luxury at the expense of the masses, and ill-treat the so-called working classes. This is why the first Christians were persecuted and why, once it became clear that they could not be suppressed, the privileged classes adopted it and perverted it. It ceased to be the celebration of the true Christianity of the first centuries and to a significant extent became the tool of the privileged classes.⁶¹

When Constantine converted to Christianity, instead of adapting politics to Jesus' teaching, "they arranged a Christianity for him, [...] they carefully devised a kind of Christianity for him that would let him continue to live his old heathen life unembarrassed."⁶²

The resulting paradox, for Tolstoy, was most visible in the army. Before Constantine, Origen had justified Christians' refusal of military service by arguing "that Christians fight more than others for the sake of the Emperor, but they do it through good deeds, prayers, and by setting a good example to others," not through armed combat.⁶³ But this changed:

Under Constantine the cross had already appeared on the standard of the Roman Legions. In 416 a decree was issued forbidding pagans to join the army. All the soldiers became Christians: that is, all the Christians, with only a few exceptions, renounced Christ.⁶⁴

And so for Christian anarchists, Christianity never recovered from this compromise with political power. Emperors, Crusades, the Inquisition, the Wars of Religion – according to Christian anarchists, none of these really have anything to do with the essence of Christianity. Those dark chapters of history were political power-games in which Christianity was hypocritically used as hypnotic cloak to mobilise the masses; and as a result, the real meaning of Jesus' teaching remained hidden under thick layers of lies and stupefying rituals.⁶⁵

Hence the net of true faith, to use Chelčický's phrase, was torn by two great predators: the pope and the emperor.⁶⁶ Christian anarchists are therefore very critical of the church's alliance with the state.⁶⁷ They accuse it of disingenuously reinterpreting

⁶⁰ In particular, see: Leo Tolstoy, "An Appeal to the Clergy," in *On Life and Essays on Religion*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1934); Tolstoy, "Church and State."; Leo Tolstoy, "The Restoration of Hell," in *On Life and Essays on Religion*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1934); Tolstoy, *What I Believe*; Leo Tolstoy, "What Is Religion, and Wherein Lies Its Essence?," in *On Life and Essays on Religion*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1934).

⁶¹ Henry George, quoted in Leo Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence," in *A Confession and Other Religious Writings*, trans. Jane Kentish (London: Penguin, 1987), 187.

⁶² Tolstoy, "Church and State," 339-340. See also Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 164.

⁶³ Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence," 188.

⁶⁴ Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence," 190.

⁶⁵ On these dark chapters of history and the church's role in them, see most of Tolstoy's political writings already mentioned above, but also (for instance) Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*.

⁶⁶ Lock, ed., *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life*.

⁶⁷ The argument summarised in this paragraph, as well as even stronger diatribes against the church, can be found in many of Tolstoy's writings, but also Lock, ed., *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life*; Missey and Thomas, eds., *The Book of Ammon*.

Jesus' radical commandments to enfeeble them and curb their politically revolutionary importance. They accuse it of further distracting its flock from these commandments by the promotion of obscure dogmas and the enactment of stupefying ritual. And they accuse it of remorselessly supporting any political authority, however violent and repressive, that offers it benefits and protection. Thus for Christian anarchists, the church is really the antichrist, portraying itself as the saviour but in fact confining Jesus' emancipatory teaching to its very opposite.

4. Enslavement to the state

As to the state, Christian anarchists claim that it fails to live up to the very purpose that it claims to fulfil. That is, far from preserving justice and security, the state merely distorts injustice and perpetuates organised violence; and in doing so, far from safeguarding individual freedoms, it systematically imprisons its citizens by a clever mix of hypnotism, economic slavery and legitimised brutality – often with the blessing of the church. That, at least, is what Leo Tolstoy says in the various political essays that he published during the last thirty years of his life, after he converted to (his very idiosyncratic understanding of) Christianity. For him, the semblance of order achieved through the state is just as unjust as the disorder that it is supposed to save humanity from. Now, the limited scope of this paper makes it impossible to summarise all the criticisms that Christian anarchists level against the state – but Tolstoy's views are a good taster.⁶⁸ Therefore, although much more can be found in some of the sources listed in the bibliography (including in Tolstoy), only part of Tolstoy's specific critique of the state as modern slavery will be outlined here.

The line of argument is fairly simple: Tolstoy first notes that there are always disagreements within society about proposed laws, and this then implies that some form of – unchristian – coercion or threat of it will always be required in order to enforce any particular law.⁶⁹ But for Tolstoy, “being compelled to do what other people wish, against your own will, is slavery.”⁷⁰ Hence if violence must always be potentially called upon to enforce laws among defiant minorities, then all laws by definition amount to slavery. Moreover, for Tolstoy, the cloak of democracy does not in the least redress this fundamental injustice:

When among one hundred men, one rules over ninety-nine, it is unjust, it is a despotism; when ten rule over ninety, it is equally unjust, it is an oligarchy; but when fifty-one rule over forty-nine (and this is only theoretical, for in reality it is always ten or eleven of these fifty-one), it is entirely just, it is freedom!

Could there be anything funnier, in its manifest absurdity, than such reasoning? And yet it is this very reasoning that serves as the basis for all reformers of the political structure.⁷¹

Tolstoy thus clearly does not consider democracy to escape from his criticism of law as amounting to slavery. Besides, as the parenthesis in this excerpt reveals, Tolstoy anyway does not believe that democracy is truly democratic: for him, it is driven by a

⁶⁸ A more detailed account of his criticisms can be found in Christoyannopoulos, "Leo Tolstoy on the State."

⁶⁹ Lyof N. Tolstoï, *What to Do?* (London: Walter Scott), 148.

⁷⁰ Leo Tolstoy, "The Slavery of Our Times," in *Essays from Tula*, trans. Free Age Press (London: Sheppard, 1948), 120.

⁷¹ Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence," 165.

small proportion of the population who impose their will upon the majority under a hypnotic pretence of democratic legitimacy.⁷²

Furthermore, on top of this legislative dimension of slavery, Tolstoy criticises the modern state for perpetuating a cunning form of economic slavery too. Tolstoy's denunciation of his contemporary economic system in fact continues to ring true today:

If the slave-owner of our time has not slave John, whom he can send to the cess-pool to clear out his excrements, he has five shillings of which hundreds of Johns are in such need that the slave-owner of our times may choose anyone out of hundreds of Johns and be a benefactor to him by giving him the preference, and allowing him, rather than another, to climb down into the cess-pool.⁷³

Whereas physical violence was once needed to force slaves into carrying out degrading work, today's more advanced economic system has so successfully transposed the coercive element into the "system" that employers can portray themselves as benefactors when they offer no less degrading work to the "lucky" employees who were picked out of many candidates who were forced to apply for such a job out of sheer hunger and economic necessity.

Such (legislative or economic) slavery, of course, does not appear to be so much of an improvement from the initial "state of nature" that humanity is assumed to have been saved from through the social contract that theoretically established the state. Indeed, the state behaves exactly like the villain it was supposed to eradicate – only on a much broader, institutionalised scale.⁷⁴ It secures obedience to its laws only through the threat and use of violence against its citizens, and thus maintains the people it was designed to save under a systemic kind of slavery. The order that it therefore protects is fundamentally unfair and unstable. Violence breeds more violence, and so sooner or later, the state's acts of violence and injustice result in retaliatory acts of further violence and injustice.⁷⁵

More to the point, the outcome is the opposite of both the letter and the spirit of Jesus' teaching. The only real alternative, for Christian anarchists, must come through an unequivocal rejection of violence. This alternative society, this anarchist vision, can only grow bottom-up, and it must be a society of peace, love, care for another, forgiveness of wrongs, and willingness to suffer in the process if need be. This alternative society, for Christian anarchists, is the true church, the gathering of radical Christians which Jesus intended his disciples to be. And for that gathering to come about, "true" Christians – that is, Christian anarchists – must lead the way, to teach it not by fear or coercion but by example. That is, Christian anarchists must "be the change they want to see," so that this revolutionary society can be built "in the shell of the old."⁷⁶

⁷² See, for instance: Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You."; Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence."; Tolstoy, "The Slavery of Our Times."

⁷³ Tolstoy, "The Slavery of Our Times," 95.

⁷⁴ Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You."

⁷⁵ George Kennan, "A Visit to Count Tolstoi," *The Century Magazine* 34/2 (1887); Leo Tolstoy, "I Cannot Be Silent," in *Recollections and Essays*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1937); Leo Tolstoy, "Thou Shalt Not Kill," in *Recollections and Essays*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1937); Leo Tolstoy, "What's to Be Done?," in *Recollections and Essays*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1937).

⁷⁶ The former quote is usually attributed to Gandhi, whose revolutionary thinking, as he himself acknowledged, was influenced by Tolstoy. The latter quote, borrowed from the International Workers of the World, is frequently repeated by Catholic Workers – for instance: Maurin, *Easy Essays*, xii, 37; Missey and Thomas, eds., *The Book of Ammon*, 232.

5. Examples, past and present

In a way, therefore, Christian anarchists would argue that Christianity has never really been tried yet on a politically significant enough scale. As already noted, the early churches did their best; but they were betrayed by the Roman authorities' manipulation of their cause. In the late Middle Ages, several millenarian movements and protestant sects (such as the Anabaptists, the Mennonites, the Hussites and the Quakers) endeavoured to apply some of the political aspects of Jesus' teachings; but although some of these survive today, they often compromised their goals in the face of persecution.⁷⁷ There are also both ancient and more recent examples of conscientious objectors inspired by Jesus' example of love and non-resistance; but these examples of bravery remained local and individual, not social.⁷⁸

Today, the Catholic Worker movement, founded by Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin, continues to strive to embody the Christian anarchist society that Jesus described through its network of houses of hospitality, through its regular publications and through its involvement in public demonstrations.⁷⁹ Thus Ammon Hennacy, another famous Catholic Worker, picketed, protested, and worked the land in what he called his "one-man revolution."⁸⁰ More recently, there are groups like the "Jesus radicals," formed on the internet, which organise conferences and discussion groups on a Christian anarchist vision for society.⁸¹ In Australia, Dave Andrews has for years worked on several projects that aim to strengthen a sense of Christian community in his neighbourhood, and his writings abound with moving examples of the impact that such beacons of love, care and forgiveness have had and can have.⁸² In Britain, in the late 1980s, a journal called *A Pinch of Salt* was published for several years to try to publicise the theory and practice of these Christian anarchist ideas, and it has recently been revived. Aside from these, there are plenty of examples of radical Christians who are trying their best to create communities that foster the sort of love and forgiveness preached by Jesus, and who also speak up, sometimes through non-violent demonstrations, against the violence and injustice perpetrated by the state.

But these are all small-scale examples. The political implications of Jesus' teaching have never really been tried yet at any society-wide level – if anything, they have been forgotten, even by self-proclaimed Christians. Almost all Christians today accept the premise that the state is necessary to preserve our freedom and security. Almost all Christians today explain away the more radical element of Jesus' message as admirable but unrealistic. And almost all Christians today accept that a good Christian ought to work within modern political institutions rather than undermine them from a religious perspective. For Christian anarchists, however, Christianity actually proposes

⁷⁷ Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*, section 3; Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, chap. 2; Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," preface and chap. 1 and 3.

⁷⁸ Eller, *Christian Anarchy*, chap. 8; Ellul, *Anarchy and Christianity*, introduction and appendix; Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence," chap. 9 and 11.

⁷⁹ *London Catholic Worker* pamphlets; Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*, section 4; Dorothy Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of the Legendary Catholic Social Activist* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1952).

⁸⁰ See his detailed autobiography: Misse and Thomas, eds., *The Book of Ammon*.

⁸¹ See <http://www.jesusradicals.com>.

⁸² See his website (<http://www.daveandrews.com.au>), for instance, as well as his books, where he often reflects on personal experiences or experiences reported to him by friends and neighbours.

a radical alternative to the state, and only Christians who stubbornly enact even the most radical of Jesus' commandments are faithful to their professed religion.

6. Religion and politics

Some may be uneasy at the sort of mix of religion and politics prescribed by Christian anarchists, yet there is no reason to fear their political activity. In the first place, the idea that violence and bloodshed automatically follows when religion ventures into politics is both short-minded and historically questionable. Indeed, Cavanaugh argues fairly convincingly that contrary to popular opinion, the modern secular state was not the white knight that saved humanity from otherwise endless religious wars.⁸³ In a nutshell, he contends that the "Wars of Religion" of the sixteenth and seventeenth century were in fact "the birthpangs of the State," that they "were fought largely for the aggrandizement of the emerging State over the decaying remnants of the medieval ecclesial order," and that "to call these conflicts 'Wars of Religion' is an anachronism, for what was at issue in these wars was the very creation of religion as a set of privately held beliefs without direct political relevance."⁸⁴ It would therefore seem hasty to categorically declare that history clearly proved that religion is the main cause of conflict and war. Besides, for Christian anarchists, it is in fact the state that epitomises the cycle of violence that humanity should evolve away from.

Many secular anarchists, for their part, may protest that anarchism rejects all rulers and tyrants, and that this list must de facto include "God." Yet as Nekeisha Alexis-Baker explains,

the simplistic representations of God as "All-powerful, the King, the Autocrat, the radical Judge, [and] the Terrible One" that are held by some anarchists and Christians is the heart of the problem. [...] Throughout the Bible, [...] God is also identified as Creator, Liberator, Teacher, Healer, Guide, Provider, Protector and Love. By making monarchical language the primary descriptor of God, Christians misrepresent the full character of God.⁸⁵

God is not some whimsical tyrant ruling his subjects from up in the clouds. What he really is, even to the tradition, remains a subtle mystery that only reveals itself through patient contemplation. But the point here is that it is too simplistic to accuse God of behaving like a dictator that any true anarchist must reject (not least since according to the New Testament he sent his Son, who is love, to save humanity from its predicament).

But what should finally appease the secularists and even give them reasons to be fond of Christian anarchists is the fact that their approach is obstinately peaceful and loving: Christian anarchism is founded on absolute non-violence, and in a world in which Abrahamic Scriptures can often be interpreted in antagonistic fashion, Christian anarchists offer a religious alternative that is refreshing precisely because of the primacy it accords to love, non-violence and charity. Hence the Christian anarchist message is really aimed first and foremost at those who define themselves as Christians, to call them to bear witness to the radical political element of their religion. To non-Christians, it would seem that all Christian anarchism has to offer is a more

⁸³ William T. Cavanaugh, "A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House: The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State," *Modern Theology* 11/4 (1995).

⁸⁴ Cavanaugh, "A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House," 398.

⁸⁵ Alexis-Baker, "Embracing God, Rejecting Masters," 2.

educated understanding of the apparent political implications of one of the world's major religions. But the hope harboured by Christian anarchists is that others can be won over and converted through the courageous bearing witness of Christians to even (if not above all) the more challenging elements of Christianity. Again, though, this first relies on Christians fanatically committing themselves to Christian love. But then that is what a literal, indeed (in that sense) "fundamentalist" exegesis of the Bible seems call to. "What a fine place this world would be," Peter Maurin thus remarked decades ago, "if Fundamentalist Protestants tried to exemplify the Sermon on the Mount."⁸⁶

Bibliography

- [Anonymous]. *Ninety-Five Theses in Defense of Patriarchy*. Vine and Fig Tree. Available from <http://members.aol.com/VF95Theses/thesis.htm> (accessed 20 April 2007).
- Alexis-Baker, Nekeisha. "Embracing God, Rejecting Masters." *Christianarchy* 1/1 (September 2005): 2.
- Alexis-Manners, Nekeisha. *Deconstructing Romans 13: Verse 1-2*. Available from <http://www.jesusradicals.com/essays/theology/Romans13.htm> (accessed 28 October 2005).
- Andrews, Dave. *Christi-Anarchy: Discovering a Radical Spirituality of Compassion*. Oxford: Lion, 1999.
- . *The Crux of the Struggle*. 2001. Available from <http://www.daveandrews.com.au/publications.html> (accessed 3 December 2006).
- . *Not Religion, but Love: Practicing a Radical Spirituality of Compassion*. Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2001.
- . *Subversive Spirituality, Ecclesial and Civil Disobedience: A Survey of Biblical Politics as Incarnated in Jesus and Interpreted by Paul*. Available from <http://anz.jesusradicals.com/subspirit.pdf> (accessed 17 July 2006).
- Baker, Andy. *Nonviolent Action in the Temple*. Available from <http://www.jesusradicals.com/essays/theology/temple.html> (accessed 16 May 2006).
- Ballou, Adin. *Christian Non-Resistance*. Friends of Adin Ballou. Available from <http://www.adinballou.org/cnr.shtml> (accessed 12 February 2007).
- . *Non-Resistance in Relation to Human Governments*. www.nonresistance.org, 1839. Available from <http://www.nonresistance.org/literature.html> (accessed 28 March 2007).
- Bartley, Jonathan. *Faith and Politics after Christendom: The Church as a Movement for Anarchy, After Christendom*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Realm of Spirit and the Realm of Caesar*. Translated by Donald A. Lowrie. London: Victor Gollancz, 1952.
- Berkhof, Hendrik. *Christ and the Powers*. Translated by John Howard Yoder. Scottdale: Herald, 1977.
- Carson, Stephen W. *Biblical Anarchism*. 7 June 2001. Available from <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/carson2.html> (accessed 8 November 2007).

⁸⁶ Maurin, *Easy Essays*, 193.

- Cavanaugh, William T. "A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House: The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State." *Modern Theology* 11/4 (October 1995): 397-420.
- Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre J. M. E. "Leo Tolstoy on the State: A Detailed Picture of Tolstoy's Denunciation of State Violence and Deception." *Anarchist Studies* 16/1 (2008): forthcoming.
- . "Turning the Other Cheek to Terrorism: Reflections on the Contemporary Significance of Leo Tolstoy's Exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount." *Politics and Religion* 1/1 (April 2008): forthcoming.
- Damico, Linda H. *The Anarchist Dimension of Liberation Theology*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Day, Dorothy. *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of the Legendary Catholic Social Activist*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1952.
- Eller, Vernard. *Christian Anarchy: Jesus' Primacy over the Powers*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1987.
- Elliott, Michael C. *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*. London: SCM, 1990.
- Ellsberg, Robert, ed. *Dorothy Day: Selected Writings: By Little and by Little*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2005.
- Ellul, Jacques. *Anarchy and Christianity*. Translated by George W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Garrison, William Lloyd. "Declaration of Sentiments Adopted by the Peace Convention." In *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, by Leo Tolstoy, translated by Aylmer Maude, 5-10. New Delhi: Rupa, 2001.
- Helms, Robert. *Hugh Owen Pentecost (1848-1907): A Biographical Sketch*. Dead Anarchists. Available from <http://www.deadanarchists.org/Pentecost/PentecostBio.html> (accessed 12 November 2007).
- Hopton, Terry. "Tolstoy, God and Anarchism." *Anarchist Studies* 8 (2000): 27-52.
- Kennan, George. "A Visit to Count Tolstoi." *The Century Magazine* 34/2 (June 1887): 252-265.
- Lock, Tom, ed. *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life and a Translation from Czech of Part One of His Net of Faith*, by Enrico C. S. Molnár. Oberlin: www.nonresistance.org, 2006. Available from <http://www.nonresistance.org/literature.html> (accessed 28 March 2007).
- Marshall, Peter. "Leo Tolstoy: The Count of Peace." In *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism*, 362-383. London: Fontana, 1993.
- Maurin, Peter. *Easy Essays*. Washington: Rose Hill, 2003.
- Missey, Jim, and Joan Thomas, eds. *The Book of Ammon*, by Ammon Hennacy. Second ed. Baltimore: Fortkamp, 1994.
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988.
- O'Reilly, Ciaran. "The Anarchist Implications of Christian Discipleship." *Social Alternatives* 2/3 (February 1982): 9-12.
- Penner, Archie. *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State, Mennonite Reprint Series*. Hagerstown: James Lowry/Deutsche Buchhandlung, 2000.
- Redford, James. *Jesus Is an Anarchist: A Free-Market, Libertarian Anarchist, That Is - Otherwise What Is Called an Anarcho-Capitalist*. 1 June 2006. Available from <http://praxeology.net/anarchist-jesus.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2006).

- Tennant, Michael. *Christianarchy? Strike the Root*, 4 May 2005. Available from <http://www.strike-the-root.com/51/tennant/tennant5.html> (accessed 21 November 2007).
- . *Government as Idolatry*. Strike the Root, 14 July 2005. Available from <http://www.strike-the-root.com/3/tennant/tennant1.html> (accessed 21 November 2007).
- Tolstoï, Lyof N. *What to Do?* London: Walter Scott.
- Tolstoy, Leo. "An Appeal to the Clergy." In *On Life and Essays on Religion*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 282-308. Vol. 12, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- . "Church and State." In *On Life and Essays on Religion*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 331-345. Vol. 12, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- . "The Gospel in Brief." In *A Confession and the Gospel in Brief*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 113-302. Vol. 11, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- . "I Cannot Be Silent." In *Recollections and Essays*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 395-412. Vol. 21, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- . "The Kingdom of God Is within You." In *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 1-421. New Delhi: Rupa, 2001.
- . "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence." In *A Confession and Other Religious Writings*, translated by Jane Kentish, 151-230. London: Penguin, 1987.
- . "The Restoration of Hell." In *On Life and Essays on Religion*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 309-330. Vol. 12, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- . "The Slavery of Our Times." In *Essays from Tula*, translated by Free Age Press, 65-136. London: Sheppard, 1948.
- . "The Teaching of Jesus." In *On Life and Essays on Religion*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 346-409. Vol. 12, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- . "Thou Shalt Not Kill." In *Recollections and Essays*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 195-203. Vol. 21, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- . "What's to Be Done?" In *Recollections and Essays*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 384-394. Vol. 21, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- . *What I Believe <My Religion>*. Translated by Fyvie Mayo? London: C. W. Daniel, [1902?].
- . "What Is Religion, and Wherein Lies Its Essence?" In *On Life and Essays on Religion*, translated by Aylmer Maude, 226-281. Vol. 12, *Tolstóy Centenary Edition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Wink, Walter. *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Woodcock, George. "The Prophet." In *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*, 207-219. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975.
- Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster*. Second ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1994.